

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-14 are amended. These amendments are supported by Applicants' specification, at least, for example at page 4, line 20- page 5 line 10, page 12, line 15- page 13, line 13, page 16, lines 7-12, page 22, line 17-page 23, line 17 and Figs. 2 and 3. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 7,171,460 to Kalavade et al. (hereinafter "Kalavade"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Kalavade discloses all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 8. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Kalavade does not teach, employing a billing gateway interface to enable a billing module to access the access server, the billing module receiving first call detail records of the mobile IP node transmitted from the access server, the billing gateway interface including an assigned billing management database with a configuration profile for each access server, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 8. Further, Kalavade does not teach, transmitting to, a proxy module a second call record detail of the mobile IP node, the proxy module capturing data relating to at least one of an identity of the mobile IP node, a duration of the obtained service, or a provider of the obtained service, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 8.

Kalavade discloses a converted billing/authorization gateway (CBG). However, the CBG interact with the WAN billing mechanism, without modification to those mechanisms, see col. 33, lines 18-90. Thus, the CBG is converting the radius accounting data directly into a billing data structure, see claim 26. Accordingly, the CBG appears to the GSM to be a standard GSM component. Kalavade has no need for employing a billing gateway interface

or a billing module to access the access server because the access server is within the CBG. For this reason, Kalavade does not disclose a billing gateway interface or billing module. Further, since the CBG in Kalavade is directly connected to the LAN the identity of the mobile node, the duration of the obtained service and provider of the obtained service are known to the CBG, therefore Kalavade does not require a proxy module to capture data relating to the identity of the IP node, a duration or the obtained service or a provider of the obtained service. For this reason Kalavade does not disclose a proxy module.

The Office Action asserts that Kalavade discloses a billing management database with a configuration of each access server in col. 18, lines 7-28 and col. 18, lines 8-11. However, the Radius server in Kalavade is part of the CBG, see element 10, Fig. 9. Since there is only one Radius server module, Kalavade has no reason for a billing management database, as recited in claims 1 and 8. Kalavade collects info from one Radius server. Further, the passages cited by the Office Action do not disclose any database.

Kalavade clearly teaches the CBG server connected to the operator network with a single radius server therefore, the CBG does not require first call detail record and second call detail record because the first and second call record details are already combined in the radius server within the CBG. Splitting call detail records in Kalavade would thus make no sense.

In view of the above Kalavade cannot reasonably be considered to teach the combinations of all of the features positively recited in claims 1 and 8. Further, Kalavade cannot reasonably be considered to teach the combinations of all of the features recited in claims 2-7 and 9-14 for at least the dependence of these claims on allowable base claims as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that these claims recite.


Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kalavade are respectfully requested.

The Office Action provisionally rejects claim 1 on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over copending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/522,767.

The attached Terminal Disclaimer obviates this rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff/
Registration No. 27,075

Daniel A. Tanner, III
Registration No. 54,734

Attachment:
Terminal Disclaimer

JAO:DAT/add

Date: May 5, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

| |
|---|
| <p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p> |
|---|